UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,769	09/21/2001	Steven Soria JR.	STL920000113US1	6311

	7590	11/13/2006		

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/960,769	SORIA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 October 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-43* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination filed October

2, 2006.

This action is made Non-Final.

2.   Claims 1-8, 10-43 are pending in the case. Claim 9 has been cancelled. Claims

1, 17 and 31 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1, 2, 3-6, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, 18-22, 24, 25, 27-29, 31-36, 38, 39, 41 and 42

remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sinander (WO

99/08206; International Publication Date February 18, 1999; from Information

Disclosure Statement filed December 18, 2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, Sinander discloses a method for supporting

versioning of data in a content management system, said method comprising:

- maintaining a first table for storing an identifier of a most recent version of a data

  item (Table 1; p.2, lines 36-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.7,

  lines 25-35; Figures 2b, 3, 4 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text,

  names/versions of the new target version (identifier of most recent version) is

  stored in the database); and

- maintaining a second table for storing an identifier of an older version of said

  data item (Table 1; p.2, lines 33-35; p.3, lines 16-25; p.5, lines 9-14; p.7, lines 25-

  35; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text,

  the name or version of the base version (identifier of older version) is stored in

  the database),

- wherein, when said data item is to be updated, (i) said second table is updated to

  include said identifier of said most recent version of said data from said first

  table, and (ii) said first table is updated to identify a new version of said data item

  (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 15-25 – as

  demonstrated in the cited text, when a version is updated, the new version prior

  to the update is moved to the database storing the older versions so that the

  updated version becomes the newest version).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising associating different version numbers with different versions of said data

item (p.7, Table 1, lines 25-35 – as demonstrated in the table and cited text, different

version numbers are associated with the base version, target version, upgrade version).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Sinander discloses the method of claim 2, wherein

each of said different versions is associated with a (version number - 1) value (p.7,

Table 1, lines 25-35 – as demonstrated in the table and cited text, the different versions

all have different values appended to the version name (1.0 for the base version, 1.1 for

the target version)).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Sinander discloses the method of claim 3, wherein a

particular version of said data item is determined based on an associated one of said

(version number - 1) values (p.7, Table 1, lines 25-35 – as demonstrated in the table

and cited text, all base versions have a value of 1.0 and all target versions have a value

of 1.1).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Sinander discloses the method of claim 3, further

comprising generating said (version number -1) value for successive versions of said

data item by incrementing said (version number - 1) value from zero (0) to n (p.7, Table

1, lines 25-35 – as demonstrated in the table and cited text, the base version (old

version) has a value of 1.0 and the target versions (newest versions) have an

incremented value of 1.1).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising generating a value for successive versions of said data item by incrementing

said version number from zero (0) to m (p.7, Table 1, lines 25-35 – as demonstrated in

the table and cited text, the base version (old version) has a version number of 1.0 and

the target versions (newest versions) have an incremented version number of 1.1).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, wherein a

version number having a value of zero (0) is associated with said most recent version of

said stored data item or an oldest version of said data item, depending on a context of

use for said version number (p.7, Table 1, lines 23-35; p.8, lines 4-9 – as demonstrated

in the table and cited text, a value of zero is associated with the oldest version of data).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, wherein an

operation including a version number having a value of zero (0) is interpreted as a

request for said most recent version of said stored data item, and said operation is

selected from a group consisting of a query operation, a retrieve operation, and an

update operation (p.2, lines 33-37; p.7, lines 25-28; p.8, lines 4-9 – as demonstrated in

the cited text, an update operation is performed and the most recent version is

requested).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising performing a query for said identifier of said most recent version or said

identifier of said older version (p.7, lines 25-35 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a

query is performed on versions of data).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, wherein a

first instance of a version of said data item is stored in said first table (p.4, lines 2-4; p.7,

lines 23-35; figures 2b, 3, 4 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text, a version of

the data is stored in a first table).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising performing a query on said first table and said second table wherein a

column attribute of a column selected by said query is retained in a result of said query

(p.7, Table 1; p.8, lines 4-9 – as demonstrated in the table and cited text, a column

attribute is retained as a result of a query).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Sinander discloses the method of claim 14, wherein

said query invokes a union operation (p.3, lines 1-7, 16-25 – as demonstrated in the

cited text, a union operation is invoked).

Regarding independent claim 17, Sinander discloses a system for supporting

versioning of data in a content management system, said system comprising:

- a memory (Figure 1; p.4, lines 26-27 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited

  text, a memory is disclosed);

- a module that maintains (a) a first table for storing an identifier of a most recent
version of a data item in said memory, and (b) a second table for storing an
identifier of an older version of said data item in said memory (Table 1; p.2, lines
33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.7, lines 25-35; p.8, lines
4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text,
names/versions of the new target version (identifier of most recent version) is
stored in the database and the name or version of the base version (identifier of
older version) is stored in the database),

- wherein, when said data item is to be updated, (i) said second table is updated to
include said identifier of said most recent version of said data from said first
table, and (ii) said first table is updated to identify a new version of said data item
(p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 15-25 – as
demonstrated in the cited text, when a version is updated, the new version prior
to the update is moved to the database storing the older versions so that the
updated version becomes the newest version).

Regarding dependent claims 18, 24, 25 and 27-29, the claims reflect the system with
means for performing the operations of claims 2, 8, 10 and 13-15 respectively and are
rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 19-22 and 33-36, the claims reflect the system and

storage medium for performing the method of claims 3-6 and are rejected along the

same rationale.

Regarding claims 31, 32, 38, 39, 41 and 42, the claims reflect the storage medium

having computer readable instructions for performing the operations of claims 1, 2, 8,

10, 14 and 15 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 7, 23 and 37 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sinander in view of Akkary et al. (U.S. Patent 6591342; date of

patent July 8, 2003; filed December 14, 1999).

Regarding dependent claims 7, 23 and 37, Sinander does not disclose m has a

predetermined maximum value. Akkary teaches a predetermined maximum value for

version numbers (col. 12, lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art, having the teachings of Sinander and Akkary before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify the version numbers taught by Sinander to include a

predetermined maximum value as taught by Akkary, because incrementing to a

predetermined maximum value would allow the system to accurately check for buffer

overflows if the version number was used as an indicator (col. 12, lines 55-65).

5.   Claims 11, 26 and 40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sinander in view of Duvillier et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020103815;

publication date August 1, 2002; filed December 12, 2000).

Regarding dependent claim 11, 26 and 40, Sinander discloses an operation including

a version number having a value of zero (0) is interpreted as a request for an oldest

version of said stored data item (p.7, lines 25-35).

Sinander does not disclose a delete operation. Duvillier teaches a delete

operation (p.6, para. 79). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art,

having the teachings of Sinander and Duvillier before him at the time the invention was

made, to modify the method taught by Sinander to include a delete operation as taught

by Duvillier, because deleting older versions of data, as taught by Duvillier (p.6, para.

79), would free memory in the system.

6.   Claims 16, 30 and 43 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sinander in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020073089;

publication date June 13, 2002; filed October 1, 2001).

Regarding dependent claim 16, 30 and 43, Sinander does not disclose column

attribute is obtained from a sequential query language description area of said query

result. Schwartz teaches SQL obtains column attributes (p.6, para. 71). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sinander and

Schwartz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught

by Sinander to include SQL obtaining column attributes as taught by Schwartz, because

SQL was well-known at the time of the invention for querying and using a well-known

language would have allowed more users to utilize the invention since there was a

familiarity with SQL.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed October 2, 2006 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive. Regarding amended independent claim 1, Applicants indicate

Sinander does not disclose (a) maintaining a first table for storing an identifier of a most

recent version of a data item, (b) maintaining a second table for storing an identifier of

an older version of said data item, wherein, when said data item is to be updated, (i)

said second table is updated to include said identifier of said most recent version of said

data from said first table, and (ii) said first table is updated to identify a new version of

said data item (p.10, para. 1). The Examiner disagrees because Sinander discloses

maintaining a first table for storing an identifier of a most recent version of a data item

(Table 1; p.2, lines 36-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.7, lines 25-

35; Figures 2b, 3, 4), and maintaining a second table for storing an identifier of an older

version of said data item (Table 1; p.2, lines 33-35; p.3, lines 16-25; p.5, lines 9-14; p.7,

lines 25-35; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4), wherein, when said data item is to be

updated, (i) said second table is updated to include said identifier of said most recent

version of said data from said first table, and (ii) said first table is updated to identify a

new version of said data item (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8,

lines 15-25). In other words, Sinander teaches a first table storing target versions and a

second table storing base versions. When a version is updated, the new version prior

to the update is moved to the database storing the older versions so that the updated

version becomes the newest version (Figure 2b).

Independent claims 17 and 31 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1 and

are therefore rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above.

Claims 2-10, 11-16, 18-30 and 32-43 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and

31 and are therefore rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above.

Regarding dependent claims 7, 23 and 37, Applicants argue that Akkary does not make up for the deficiency of the Sinander application, as Sinander relates to claims 1, 17 and 31 (p.11, para. 5). The Examiner disagrees because dependent claims 7, 23 and 37 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 31 and are therefore rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above.

Regarding dependent claims 11, 26 and 40, Applicants argue that Duvillier does not make up for the deficiency of the Sinander application, as Sinander relates to claims 1, 17 and 31 (p.11, para. 8). The Examiner disagrees because dependent claims 7, 23 and 37 depend from independent claims 11, 26 and 40 and are therefore rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:00 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KBH

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER